

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**DARIAN LEE EDDY,**

**Plaintiff**

**v.**

**CAROLYN W. COLVIN and  
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,**

**Defendants**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CIVIL ACTION NO.:**

**2:13-CV-5370-CDJ**

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2015, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable David R. Strawbridge, United States Magistrate Judge, (Doc. No. 17), is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.<sup>1</sup> The above-captioned matter is **REMANDED** to the Social Security Administration for proceedings consistent with the Report and Recommendation.

**BY THE COURT:**

**/s/ C. Darnell Jones, II J.**  
**C. DARNELL JONES, II J.**

---

<sup>1</sup> When a party files timely objections to the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court must review *de novo* those portions of the report and recommendation to which objection is made. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). If there are no objections to the report and recommendation or when reviewing those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are directed, the court should, as a matter of good practice, “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987). No objections have been filed to the Report and Recommendation, but the Court has nonetheless reviewed it for clear error.